```
M991SMIC
      UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
1
      SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
 2
 3
      UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
 4
                                               22 Cr. 352 (JSR)
                 V.
5
      JATIEK SMITH,
                     Defendant.
6
                                              Conference
 7
                                               New York, N.Y.
                                                September 9, 2022
 8
                                                3:11 p.m.
9
10
     Before:
11
                            HON. JED S. RAKOFF,
12
                                               District Judge
13
                                 APPEARANCES
14
      DAMIAN WILLIAMS
15
           United States Attorney for the
           Southern District of New York
     BY: MARY E. BRACEWELL, ESQ.
16
           RUSHMI BHASKARAN, ESQ.
17
           Assistant United States Attorneys
18
      THE VITALIANO LAW FIRM, PLLC
           Attorneys for Defendant
      BY: MICHAEL VITILIANO, ESQ.
19
20
     ALSO PRESENT: EVELYN ALVAYERO, U.S. Pretrial Services Officer
21
22
23
24
25
```

(Case called)

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Will everyone please be seated and will the parties please identify themselves for the record.

MS. BRACEWELL: Good afternoon, your Honor. Mollie
Bracewell appearing for the government, with my colleague, AUSA
Rushmi Bhaskaran, and also at counsel table is Pretrial Officer
Evelyn Alvayero.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

MR. VITALIANO: Good afternoon, your Honor. For Mr. Smith, Michael Vitaliano.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

So we have several matters to take up. The first is arraignment. So let me ask defense counsel whether you have gone over Indictment 22 Cr. 352 with Mr. Smith and whether you want it read again here in open court or whether you waive the public reading.

MR. VITALIANO: I waive the public reading, your Honor, and I have reviewed the indictment with Mr. Smith.

THE COURT: Would you like a plea of not guilty entered at this point?

MR. VITALIANO: Yes, Judge.

THE COURT: A plea of not guilty will be entered.

Now we had previously, at the request of all the defense counsel, set a trial date of May 1st of next year, and also dates for the submission of various motions, but I

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

received a letter from Mr. Smith which, in the first paragraph, reads as follows:

"I'm writing to you regarding my criminal case,
No. 22 Cr. 352. I'm wishing to waive my rights to file any
motions and proceed to a speedy trial. I understand the
purpose of the motions, and my lawyer has advised me as best he
can. I am disregarding his advice and would like to proceed
with trial."

So let me find out, both from counsel and from Mr. Smith, whether that is still his position.

MR. VITALIANO: Judge, may I have one moment to confer with my client.

THE COURT: Yes.

(Mr. Vitaliano conferring with the defendant)

MR. VITALIANO: Your Honor, against advice of counsel,
Mr. Smith still at this time wants to have a speedy trial.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Smith, is that your position?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: And you don't want your counsel to file any motions?

THE DEFENDANT: No.

THE COURT: Okay. So let's see. Under the Speedy

Trial Act, that would mean that the case should be tried within

70 days. Let me look at my trial schedule.

So about how long a trial are we talking about, just

1 against Mr. Smith? MS. BRACEWELL: Because he is the lead defendant, I 2 3 would still expect our proof to be in the order of three weeks. 4 THE COURT: Well, I'm skeptical, but I hear what you say. So I think we can set it down for early November. 5 6 What day of the week is November 7th? 7 THE DEPUTY CLERK: It is a Monday. 8 THE COURT: Okay. And I know we have a civil trial 9 that week, which we can move. Anything the following week? 10 THE DEPUTY CLERK: You are sitting by designation in 11 Phoenix. THE COURT: But that may be, as it's turning out, only 12 13 three days, so we can still have two or three days of trial 14 that week. 15 THE DEPUTY CLERK: And I also should tell you that Tuesday, November 8th, this year the courthouse is closed for 16 17 Election Day; and the Friday of that week, November 11th, is 18 Veterans Day, and the courthouse is closed. 19 THE COURT: All right. Let's go back to October 17th. 20 We have a civil case, again, which I can move. 21 THE DEPUTY CLERK: Right. 22 THE COURT: We have a criminal case starting the next

THE COURT: We have a criminal case starting the next week, but we can move that a little bit too, I think. Anything else the following week?

23

24

25

THE DEPUTY CLERK: No, just a continuation of the

other trial.

THE COURT: So I think we can try this case beginning October 17th. Any problems with that on the part of the defense?

MR. VITALIANO: No, Judge.

October 17th against Mr. Smith. All the other defendants are hereby severed, and we'll continue with the trial schedule and motion schedule that they have set in place. Some of them filed letters after Mr. Smith's letter that were suspiciously very similar to Mr. Smith's letter, almost word for word, but at least one has already withdrawn that, a second one has indicated his intention to withdraw it, and I have a feeling that only Mr. Smith wants to proceed in the manner he's just indicated.

So I will exclude from calculations under the Speedy Trial Act all time between now and October 17th, finding that it's not really necessary, that will be a speedy trial, but that in any event, that is a reasonable time for he and his counsel to prepare for the trial, and that for those and other reasons evident from this proceeding, the best interests of justice in excluding such time substantially outweighs the interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.

MS. BRACEWELL: Your Honor --

THE COURT: So anything else regarding that before we

turn to bail?

MS. BRACEWELL: Yes, your Honor. We were wondering if we could revisit slightly the trial date, only because one of the AUSAs is out on paternity leave. I have another trial that same week. If we were able to do it in November, we are --

November. I mean, the only possibility in November would be late November, where I already have two trials that would have to be moved, and my courtroom deputy points out, one of those two trials on November 30th is a civil trial that's been moved repeatedly and I told counsel we would endeavor not to move it again; the other is a criminal trial, starting November 21st; and sometime in there is Thanksgiving. So we wouldn't have a full trial week. So I appreciate that this is a hardship on the government, but I don't see any reasonable alternatives.

MS. BRACEWELL: Your Honor, even if we had to schedule it in January. You know, given the short turnaround, it would be incredibly difficult for new prosecutors to familiarize themselves with the case and the witnesses.

THE COURT: Well, I understand that, although this is a case that you've been pursuing for some time, and moreover, it's a case that, even under the new trial date, is, what, five, six weeks from now, so it's not like you don't have meaningful time. And the Speedy Trial Act is something this Court takes very seriously, and Mr. Smith has invoked his

24

25

rights under the act. If there were a November date that would 1 work, I would consider it. So let's revisit that for a moment. 2 3 But I don't see going to January. 4 Now just before we consider November again, tell me 5 specifically, in terms of personnel, who is out on maternity leave? 6 7 MS. BRACEWELL: Adam Hobson, the third AUSA on this case, had a baby just the last couple of weeks. 8 9 believe-though we can confer with him-that he was expecting to 10 be on paternity leave for the next couple of months. 11 THE COURT: All right. So that's not going to help us 12 either way. 13 MS. BRACEWELL: Right. Though I think he could -right. I have a trial starting on October 24th in front of 14 15 Judge Torres. 16 THE COURT: In front of Judge? 17 MS. BRACEWELL: Torres. 18 THE COURT: So I would certainly be happy to call 19 Judge Torres and see if I can get her to adjust that schedule. 20 What is that, a multidefendant case or --21 MS. BRACEWELL: It's a one-defendant case. It's a 22 retrial of a case that was tried this past May. 23 THE COURT: I'm sorry?

It's a short trial, approximately one week.

MS. BRACEWELL: Sorry. I missed the microphone.

THE COURT: So let me ask you this: Would you prefer to move that up earlier and get it done in September, assuming she has availability, or would you rather have it pushed to like December?

MS. BRACEWELL: You know, I'm amenable to any schedule that the Court can accommodate. I don't want to speak for -- there's other trial team members as well whose schedules are being negotiated and implicated, so I can't speak sort of broadly.

THE COURT: All right. So I will call Judge Torres—I have no guarantee, of course, it's up to her, but—see if she is amenable to moving — what's the name of the case?

MS. BRACEWELL: U.S. v. Timothy Shea.

THE COURT: And the docket number, if you happen to have it?

MS. BRACEWELL: I should have it, but I don't.

THE COURT: All right. Just send it to me by email after this proceeding.

MS. BRACEWELL: Understood.

And your Honor, just for the record, and given the statements we've made about the volume of discovery, in our view, it would be helpful to allocute the defendant — particularly given defense counsel's representations today that this is over his advice, if the defendant is allocuted on the fact that this trial schedule may implicate his and defense

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

counsel's ability to review the discovery.

THE COURT: Yes. Well, of course, that's self-evident. But let me go through that, and then we'll talk to both Mr. Smith and his counsel.

So the reason this case was put on an extended track is because all your co-defendants' counsel, when they learned that the government had lots of discovery to give to counsel, and that it would take an extended time to review that discovery, and also because they wanted to see whether there were important motions that could be brought to limit the case, and because, as responsible counsel, they thought that it would be very seriously harmful to their clients to proceed on a swift track, they all suggested-wasn't even my suggestion, it was their suggestion—that we move the case much later, and they felt-and this, of course, is something that lawyers have much more expertise than defendants about—that they couldn't really do a good job of defending their clients until they had had extensive time to review the discovery, until they had seen whether any of that discovery was subject to motion practice that might eliminate some of the government's proof or even some of the government's charges, and that they then wanted the opportunity to talk to their own witnesses and investigate the And so I am sure you recognize, but just let me confirm, that you understand all that and you still want to go to trial in October.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. And the government will therefore do their best to provide the discovery to Mr. Smith's counsel as rapidly as possible, but he will not be heard to complain that it's voluminous or that he doesn't have enough time to review it or anything of the sort.

And similarly, because of the considerable difficulties that the government will be put to by Mr. Smith's lawful election of his speedy trial rights, no requests for extension under any circumstances whatsoever by the defense will be granted.

So I hope you know what you're doing, Mr. Smith, but it's your choice.

So let's turn to the bail application.

So I've received the application from defense counsel, and I thank also the many fine people who submitted letters.

So let me hear first from the government, and then we'll hear from defense counsel.

MS. BRACEWELL: Yes, your Honor. We are seeking detention, continued detention here, because the defendant is both a danger to the community and because we think there's a substantial risk of flight here.

This defendant, as I mentioned a moment ago, is the lead defendant. He is the mastermind of this entire enterprise. He was instrumental in taking over First Response,

and he was instrumental in using First Response to take over the industry. He's intimidated witnesses, he sought to obstruct justice, he's participated in assaults and directed others to conduct assaults, and he's personally threatened and terrorized others. We think the evidence overwhelmingly shows his dangerousness. Some examples are already put out in our bail letter, but I'm going to highlight them just for ease of reference.

In an assault on November 13th of 2020, one witness was — one victim was conversing with Jatiek Smith only moments before he was punched in the head at that same job site.

Jatiek Smith was trying to direct that victim to assign business towards First Response for the particular company it had selected. Another defendant, Manuel Pereira, then sent Jatiek Smith a video of that assault. So he was in touch with the person, both before and after, we believe.

In the spring of 2021, we have another witness testimony about Jatiek Smith's involvement in a group assault, an employee of another rival EMS company. Jatiek Smith was present, along with two other co-conspirators and numerous others. They encircled this victim and beat him. They punched him approximately 15 times. Jatiek Smith was heard at the scene saying, "I got 13-year-old kids out here looking to make a name for themselves. I'll give them a gun, they can kill you or your family."

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Those are the same kinds of words we hear on recordings recovered from the defendant's own phone. a phone obtained covertly in the course of the investigation in the context of a border stop. Numerous recordings were found on that phone in which Jatiek Smith describes what he's doing, describes using threats, and in fact records one meeting he had with EMS companies. He says such things as, "Y'all [N word] play with me, I'll kill one of your kids. I'll kill one of your kids just to send a message, to send a message. Who the fuck y'all [N words] think y'all playing with? I'm not a sucker. Y'all [N words] think that fire chasing business is something. I'm a gang member. I been gang banging for years. I'll kill one of you [N words] to send a message. That's the messages I send, man."

That's words that we recovered and transcribed from a recording on his phone. It's entirely consistent with what our witness testimony has corroborated and set out that he is running a violent enterprise to intimidate and bring into line anyone who threatens his business.

He's also been sort of single-handedly responsible for the obstruction of justice and witness tampering that we've discussed with this Court before. Other co-conspirators have been present, but his involvement shows that he is running that portion of the enterprise.

For example, he recently, in late spring of this year,

once the investigation was known to him, gathered various people in his presence, he patted them down and he described that he would intimidate them, he would kill — he would kill the attendees and take them down with him, in the context of discussing the investigation; the implication being, if these individuals cooperated against him, their lives were at stake. And this isn't hyperbole, given that this same language appears again and again in the words that witnesses recount and in the recordings that we have from his phone and in intercepted communications.

So the offense conduct here is staggering. The evidence of it is overwhelming.

The defendant's criminal history is also alarming in its length and severity and consistency. I don't need to tell your Honor what's in the pretrial report, but I would just note that the defendant was on probation from 2017 to 2020. That is when he was launching this enterprise, and he successfully took over much of the industry. He is obviously not susceptible to supervision in the community.

And I also want to bring to your Honor's attention certain events that have transpired more recently than the indictment being returned. The defendant was in Puerto Rico at the time of his arrest. HSI agents and various other law enforcement agents executed that arrest warrant. He was there with various family members, including his children. He became

very aggressive when law enforcement sought to execute the arrest warrant. He stated — he swatted the hands away of one of the agents and stated he was not no "B word" and he wasn't gonna let any of us arrest him and, "You all, you are going to have to kill me." He then kept the phones in his hands, refused to hand them over or surrender to law enforcement. It took nearly one hour and 45 minutes for them to actually execute the arrest. This was in the presence of his family members and the children that are cited extensively in defense counsel's submission.

I'm saying all that because I think it's very clear from the context of this arrest that there's a flight risk here. The defendant is now increasingly aware of the overwhelming proof that there is against him. It's clear that his family was present then and he certainly wasn't brought into line or, you know, didn't respond to clear directives or the fact of the arrest warrant.

He's also had two other recent criminal incidents related to him. On June 4th of 2022, he was arrested at Home Depot stealing things with co-conspirator Sequan Jackson.

June 20, 2022 --

THE COURT: Let me take the liberty of interrupting you.

MS. BRACEWELL: Sure.

THE COURT: You've brought to my attention a number of

allegations that bear on danger to the community. What is your evidence with respect to danger of flight?

MS. BRACEWELL: Right. So risk of flight, first, I think the context of his arrest -- my detailing of the arrest in Puerto Rico I think is illustrative. His refusal to surrender to law enforcement certainly suggests that his detention is potentially necessary.

Additionally, I would note that the pretrial report describes a number of bench warrants; it describes various criminal conduct while he's on supervision. That's what I was alluding to in the 2017-2020 period. This is someone who has a long criminal record and has never — has proven himself not to be susceptible to community supervision, which is necessary if he's released.

A few other points just to drive home. We discussed various references to guns. At the time of the search, we recovered four guns in the First Response office that was controlled by the defendant. So in addition to his frequent references and threats with guns, he was in fact in possession of various guns that he can and would use.

So the evidence, in our view, is overwhelming, the danger to the community is overwhelming, but particularly with the nature of the allegations, the credible allegation of witness tampering and obstruction of justice, this is not a defendant that can be safely released into the community.

THE COURT: All right. Let me hear from defense counsel.

MR. VITALIANO: Thank you, Judge.

First, I'd like to introduce Mr. Smith's family and friends who are all in the courtroom today. That is a testament to Mr. Smith's character as a person. These individuals know Mr. Smith's past. They know that Mr. Smith has now begun to make better choices in his life. And your Honor, as detailed in the multitude of letters, Mr. Smith is a leader in his community. He cares for his community, he cares about people, he cares about his children.

And your Honor, first, I would like to just touch on the flight risk.

Mr. Smith is absolutely not a flight risk. Mr. Smith was in Puerto Rico. He was there celebrating the graduation of his daughter. When the agents came, it's my understanding that Mr. Smith went willingly with the agents. The only thing that upset Mr. Smith was the fact that his kids were searched by the agents.

And one of the letters that your Honor received was from an old attorney of Mr. Smith's. That attorney spoke about how Mr. Smith was out on bail during trial, was convicted, was sentenced, and he still returned to court. I think that is overwhelming evidence that Mr. Smith is someone who is not a flight risk.

As to the dangerousness to the community, as stated in all the previous letters --

THE COURT: Well, everything you say is important. If I read that letter from the lawyer correctly, just to correct the record, he was acquitted of the two main charges. He was only convicted of a lesser charge. I don't think it detracts from your point, but I just want to make the record clear on that.

MR. VITALIANO: Yes.

THE COURT: And then later on, the government dropped the third charge --

MR. VITALIANO: Correct.

THE COURT: -- as well.

MR. VITALIANO: But throughout the pendency of that case, the point is that Mr. Smith continued --

THE COURT: No, no, your point is still valid. I just wanted to make the record clear.

MR. VITALIANO: As to the dangerousness to the community, again, these are all allegations against Mr. Smith. As the letters detail, they are diametrically opposed to what the government details Mr. Smith as. I think the defense investigation is eventually going to show the Court and show the government that Mr. Smith wasn't an instigator of any of these fights. Mr. Smith quelled the violence. He was someone who --

MR. VITALIANO: Judge, I think a lot of the recordings, it's true that -- it's mere hyperbole, it's mere speech. He's not someone who's going to act out. He's someone who tries to do his best for the community.

THE COURT: What about all those recordings?

And your Honor, I know the government brought up some of his prior convictions. And, you know, the Bail Reform Act, they're not -- someone's prior criminal history should not impact whether or not he should be detained.

I think the conditions that we have proposed for your Honor, with the \$750,000 bail, five financially responsible persons signing the bail, his home being at risk, I think all of those conditions can satisfy safety to the community; it will ensure his appearance in court. And I know your Honor read about Mr. Smith's incarceration prior to being here today, and the struggles that he endured. I think the prospect of Mr. Smith going back into prison while he's a presumed innocent man is enough of a deterrence to ensure the safety of the community.

THE COURT: All right. Well, thank you very much.

And I want to thank, again, the various members of Mr. Smith's family and circle of friends for their important letters that they submitted as well.

With respect to the question of flight, I think there probably are reasonable conditions that could assure against

flight. But I'm going to deny bail because I think the government has shown quite convincingly, clearly and convincingly, that there is no set of conditions that will assure against danger to the community. Mr. Smith unquestionably has done some very positive things, which I applaud and I see that as one part of his personality. But the government has strikingly strong evidence, as recounted, of his involvement in a series of violent and threatened violent acts over a period of time, orchestrated by him, and that I think shows a very different side of the defendant's personality.

I'm glad that he has elected a speedy trial because therefore, we will bring this to a conclusion one way or the other within a matter of a couple of months or less. But even if he had elected the longer schedule that his co-defendants have elected, I would still be persuaded by the government that there is too great a danger here to allow his release.

All right. Anything else we need to take up today?
MR. VITALIANO: No, Judge.

MS. BRACEWELL: Not from the government. Thank you.

THE COURT: Very good. Thanks a lot.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: All rise.